

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 20, 2006
J. MARTIN GRIESEL CONFERENCE ROOM
TWO CENTENNIAL PLAZA – SUITE 700
805 CENTRAL AVENUE**

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Faux called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

Commission Members:

Present: Caleb Faux, Jacquelyn McCray, Rainer vom Hofe, Milton Dohoney and James Tarbell

Community Development and Planning Staff: Margaret Wuerstle, Bonnie Holman, Jennifer Walke and Felix Bere

Law Department:

Julia Carney

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Submission of the minutes from the October 6, 2006 Planning Commission meeting for approval.

Motion:	Ms. McCray moved approval of minutes.
Second:	Mr. vom Hofe
Ayes:	Mr. Faux, Ms. McCray, Mr. vom Hofe and Mr. Dohoney
Nays:	None, motion carried

Note: Item #1 was removed from the agenda due to issues that needed to be resolved regarding the flood plain.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

ITEM #2 A report and recommendation on an expiring Planned Development (PD) district No. 29 – Paxton Avenue within the Oakley Neighborhood.

BACKGROUND:

Planned Development District No. 29 was established on January 13, 2004 when City Council adopted the current Zoning Code. It will expire on February 14, 2007. Since November 10, 1999 and prior to the property becoming a PD, it was zoned R-3 (T), Two-Family Transition District. The Transitional zone designation was changed to a Planned Development District with the intention of studying this PD district at a later date to determine a more suitable permanent zoning classification. The PD was established to allow for more efficient and economic development of property than ordinarily permitted by conventional zoning and subdivision regulations while ensuring that any development is compatible with the surrounding area. Staff completed the zoning study and recommended retention of the established PD No. 29. This PD consists of the Drexel at Oakley, a luxury apartment complex located at 3827 Paxton Avenue. The entire site is already built out and no other zoning designation accommodates this site's layout or design. Hence, the PD is needed beyond the date of its prescribed expiration.

The approved site plan and the development guidelines for the Transitional District preceding PD No. 29 will serve as the Approved Final Development Plan for the Planned Development.

The following development guidelines were approved for the Transition District and have been updated to reflect the existing Zoning Code's districts and regulations.

1. Vehicular or pedestrian access is not permitted from Ferdinand Place.
2. Lighting must be arranged so as to reflect light away from adjoining properties.
3. All entrance and exit locations to a parking garage must be equipped with electronic gates.
4. The permitted and conditional uses are limited to those allowed in Chapter ~~1415, R-5 Multi-Family Medium-Density~~ [1405 RM-1.2 Residential Multi-Family](#) District.
5. Any development must comply with the standards set forth in ~~SEC. 1415-400 (a), (b), (d), (f), (g), and (h), Requirements of the R-5~~ [Schedule 1405-07 Development Regulations - For the RM-1.2 Residential Multi-Family](#) District.
6. Any development is limited to one indirectly illuminated identification sign erected as a ground sign not exceeding 20 square feet on either side.
7. A residential development may not exceed 200 dwelling units.
8. Buildings are limited to a height of 45 feet or four stories whichever is less.
9. A buffer yard comprised of existing trees and new evergreen trees, 6' to 8' in height, planted no less than ten feet on center, interrupted only by existing trees, must be provided along the property line adjoining the homes on Oak park Place to visually obscure the development from those homes.

Community Input

The Oakley Community Council (OCC) supports the retention of the PD zoning district. The Apartment Investments LLC, the property owners concurs with OCC and staff that PD #29 should be retained. Additionally, no one has voiced opposition to the continuation of the PD zoning currently on the property.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department of Community Development and Planning staff recommended that the City Planning Commission take the following actions:

(A). Allow Planned Development (PD) District No. 29 in Oakley to remain permanently beyond the expiration date of February 14, 2007.

(B). Adopt the Site Development Plan and the development guidelines for the former R-3 (T) zoning district as updated as the Final Development Plan.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Felix Bere, Senior Planner, presented this report.

Mr. Bere gave a brief history of PD 29 which is scheduled to expire in February 2007. He stated that the site is currently built up and no existing zoning designation would be appropriate. Therefore, the best course of action would be to make the PD designation permanent with the updated transition zone guideline serving as the development regulations for the PD.

Motion: Ms. McCray moved approval of Item #2.

Second: Mr. vom Hofe
Ayes: Mr. Faux, Ms. McCray, Mr. vom Hofe and Mr. Dohoney
Nays: None, **motion carried**

Mr. Tarbell arrived at 9:15 AM.

ITEM #3 A report and recommendation on the proposed text amendment to the Cincinnati Zoning Code on a new zoning district entitled Urban Mix and a zone change from Manufacturing General to Urban Mix in the community of Over-the-Rhine.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Petitioner:

The Brewery District Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation
President: Duane Donohoo
4030 Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road, Suite 112
Cincinnati, Ohio 45255

Purpose:

To create a mixed-use district in Cincinnati that permits residential and light manufacturing in inner city areas.

BACKGROUND:

The Brewery District Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation (Brewery District) raised concerns during the creation of the new zoning code about the Manufacturing General (MG) zoning district that was applied to the area north of Findlay Market. Under the previous code, the area was zoned M-2. The MG was applied to reflect the predominant zoning and land uses in the area, while creating as few nonconforming uses as possible. The area contains a mix of single family, multi-family, office and warehouse structures. Many of the vacant warehouses and breweries in the area are being converted to residential units and lofts.

After the adoption of the new zoning code in 2004, the City Council approved a 1-year grace period permitting individuals to request a zoning study free of charge if they felt that their property was zoned incorrectly. At that time, the Brewery District submitted a zone change application request for the establishment of a new Urban Mix (UM) District that they created for the area. The goals of the UM District are to promote pedestrian-oriented development while allowing for a full range of residential, business and light manufacturing uses to stimulate development in the area.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Adjacent Land Use and Zoning:

North: Multi-family structures, RM 1.2

East: Mixed use residential and commercial structures, CC-P

South: Findlay Market, CC-P

West: Primarily large commercial buildings fronting Central Parkway, CC-A

Existing Plans:

The Over-the-Rhine Comprehensive Plan (2002) recommended, with the exception of Grant Park, that the area north of Findlay Street be zoned and developed as Mixed-Use Loft Space. The plan states that:

The loft district is intended to encompass a wide variety of businesses and housing opportunities including office/commercial, light manufacturing, artists' studios, and housing. Older manufacturing and industrial buildings, with their large open floor plates

and massive windows, present limitless opportunities for creative and unique developments (page 2).

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The Department of Community Development and Planning staff conducted two public conferences on this text amendment and zone change request. The conference held on April 4, 2005 was to discuss the zone change request. Representatives of the Brewery District in attendance were Duane Donohoo (Donohoo Properties, 256 Mohawk), Wade Dent (Pencil Dart, LLC, 222 E. 14th Street), Denny Dellinger (Metal Blast Building, 208 Mohawk), Jeff Raser (Glaserworks, 304 E. 8th Street), Omar Childress (1910 Elm). Residents and property owners in attendance were Jessie Thomas (2029 Dunlap), Jeff Funk (268 Stark Street), Christopher Phillips (G.C. Pace, 226 Mohawk). City Staff in attendance were Margaret Wuerstle (Chief Planner) and Jennifer Walke (City Planner). All parties were in favor of the change.

The conference held on September 29, 2006 was to discuss the proposed text amendment and the proposed zone change. Those in attendance were Jeff Raser (GlaserWorks), Denny Dellinger (Brewery District), Wade Dent (property owner), Sarah T. Allen (Over-the-Rhine Community Housing), Omar Childress (self), Kathy Farro (Manely Burke), Vince Schirmer (Oakley), Pierrette Wallace (self), Peter Huttinger (Homeadow Song Farm, Winton Place), Sue Hagedorn (Winton Place), John Berry (Cole+Russell Architects). City staff in attendance were Jennifer Walke (City Planner) and Katherine Keough-Jurs (Senior City Planner). Seven people in attendance were in support of the text amendment and zone change; three people in attendance were present to learn more about the proposal. No one in attendance was opposed to the change.

Staff also received letters in support of the proposed text amendment and zone change from five property owners. The Over-the-Rhine Community Council also supports the change.

CITY STAFF COMMENT

The Departments of Law, Transportation and Engineering, Buildings and Inspections and Community Development and Planning have reviewed the proposed designation. Some staff expressed concerns that the proposed district is similar to existing districts such as Manufacturing Limited (ML) and Commercial Neighborhood Pedestrian (CN-P) and will be underused.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CHANGE:

The current zoning designation, MG, reflects many of the current uses of the district, but does not promote the development goals of the neighborhood, such as increasing residential uses and pedestrian-oriented development. Unlike the proposed UM District, MG does not permit residential uses, with the exception of Transitional Housing. The ML District only permits residential uses when they are adjacent to existing residential uses. This proves to be problematic as development trends push for warehouses and breweries, located in primarily manufacturing areas, to be converted into loft dwelling units. The MG District also permits uses that the community finds undesirable, such as Transitional Housing (all programs), sexually oriented businesses, correctional institutions and juvenile detention facilities. The proposed UM district is similar to the existing CN-P District; however, CN-P does not permit outdoor and large-scale recreation/entertainment uses nor does it permit artisan production industry uses, which are recommended for the subject property in the Over-the-Rhine Comprehensive Plan (2002).

The Over-the-Rhine and West End neighborhoods are designated as Live/Work Districts by Council, which permits an owner to live in the building in which s/he works. The UM District differs from the Live Work District, because it promotes adaptive reuse of vacant structures into residential units where there will be no commercial or industrial activity occurring.

In addition, at its meeting on August 4, 2006, Planning Commission instructed staff to proceed with the Urban Mix text amendment and zone change.

CONCLUSION:

1. Industrial areas, especially in the inner city, are needed to provide jobs to skilled and unskilled laborers. There is a scarcity of industrial property available in the city. In the proposed UM District, ML uses are permitted and MG uses are permitted as a conditional use.
2. There are other areas in Cincinnati that contain a mix of residential and manufacturing uses that could benefit from Urban Mix zoning: Northside, South Cumminsville, West End, Lower Price Hill Camp Washington.
3. The City of Cincinnati, State of Ohio and Federal regulations dealing with health issues, building standards, noise and pollution address the compatibility of mixed uses in the Urban Mix zoning designation.
4. Larger cities, such as New York and Chicago have mixed use designations to promote the development of hip, urban areas.
5. The Urban Mix designation is consistent with the new urbanism concepts that promote mixed use, walkable communities, with employment opportunities.
6. The City needs to promote revitalization of our urban neighborhoods. Flexible codes provide opportunity for creative development projects.
7. The existing Zoning Code does not meet the needs of older neighborhoods that developed as mixed-use, manufacturing and residential districts. Manufacturing uses are not suitable for all residential areas; however this is a unique situation that should be given careful review and consideration.

RECOMMENDATION:

Department of Community Development and Planning staff recommended that City Planning Commission take the following actions:

ADOPT the text amendment to include Urban Mix Zoning District in the Cincinnati Zoning Code and

APPROVE the zone change for certain property located north of Findlay Street in Over-the-Rhine from Manufacturing General to Urban Mix.

Chapter 1418. Urban Mix District

§ 1418-01. PURPOSES.....6

§ 1418-05. LAND USE REGULATIONS.....6

§ 1418-07. DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.....11

§ 1418-09 (AMEND 1425-19).OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REQUIREMENTS.....12

§ 1418-01. Purposes.

The general purposes of Urban Mix district are to:

- (a) Provide a balance of uses and amenities fostering a vital economic, livable and cultural area and enhance its urban, aesthetic qualities.
- (b) Protect and enhance historic, cultural, economic and architectural resources.
- (c) Preserve, create and enhance pedestrian-oriented streets to encourage retail, entertainment, residential and office vitality and improve the quality of life for district residents, visitors and workers
- (d) Provide quality public spaces, such as urban street corridors, by maintaining the physical continuity of the street edge created by buildings.
- (e) Bring most daily activities within walking distance, giving the elderly, young and disabled increased independence of movement.
- (f) Reduce the number of automobile trips, minimize congestion, consumption of resources and air and noise pollution.

FIGURES 1418-03-A-D The following illustrations represent examples of the Urban Mix district:



Figure 1418-03-A: UM



Figure 1418-03-B: UM



Figure 1418-03-C: UM



Figure 1418-03-D: UM

§ 1418-05. Land Use Regulations.

Schedule 1418-05 below prescribes the land use regulations for the UM District. The regulations are established by letter designations as follows:

- (g) "P" designates permitted uses. These uses may be subject to additional regulations as indicated.
- (h) "L" designates uses that are permitted, subject to certain limitations. Numeric suffixes refer to limitations listed at the bottom of Schedule 1405-05.
- (i) "C" designates uses permitted only after review and approval of the conditional use by the Zoning Hearing Examiner. These uses may be subject to additional regulations as indicated.

Use classifications are defined in Chapter 1401, Definitions. Use classifications not listed in Schedule 1418-05 below are prohibited.

Schedule 1418-05: Use Regulations – Urban Mix District

Use Classifications		UM	Additional Regulations
<i>Residential Uses</i>			
Group Residential	Bed and breakfast home	P	
	Child day care home	L2	
	Group residential		
	Congregate housing	P	
	Convents and monasteries	L7	
	Fraternities, sororities, dormitories	L7	
	Patient family homes	L7	
	Rooming houses	L1	
	Shared housing for the elderly	L7	
Permanent Residential	Single-family dwelling	P	See § 1403-11
	Attached single-family dwelling	P	See § 1403-11
	Rowhouse, single-family dwelling	P	
	Two-family dwelling	P	
	Three-family dwelling	P	
	Multi-family dwelling	P	
Residential Care Facilities	Assisted living	P	
	Developmental disability dwelling	P	
	Nursing home	P	
Special Assistance Shelter		C	
Transitional Housing	Programs 1-4	P	
	Program 5	--	
	Program 6	--	
<i>Public and Semipublic Uses</i>			
Cemeteries			
Clubs and lodges		P	

Colleges, Public or Private	P	
Community service facilities	C	
Cultural institutions	P	
Day Care Center	P	
Government Facilities and Offices	Correctional Institutions	--
	Facilities and Institutions	--
	Juvenile Detention Facilities	--
	Offices	P
Hospitals	P	
Parks and recreation facilities	P	
Public maintenance Facilities	C	
Public safety facilities	P	
Religious assembly	P	
Schools, public or private	P	
Commercial Uses		
Ambulance Services	C	
Animal Services	C	See § 1419-05
Banks and Financial Institutions	L9	See § 1419-13
ATM, Stand Alone	C	
Bed and breakfast inns	P	See § 1419-09
Building maintenance services	P	
Building material sales & services	L3	
Business services	P	
Commercial meeting facilities	C	
Eating and Drinking Establishments	Drinking establishments	P
	Restaurants, Full Service	L9 See § 1419-21
	Restaurants, Limited Service	L9 See § 1419-21
Food markets	L9	
Food preparation	P	
Funeral and interment services	P	
Garden supply stores & nurseries	C	
Hotels & commercial lodging	P	
Laboratories, commercial	L6	
Loft dwelling units	P	See § 1419-23
Maintenance & repair services	P	
Medical services and clinics	P	
Offices	P	
Parking facilities	C	See § 1425, § 1411-25
Personal instructional services	P	
Personal services	P	

Private vehicular storage lot		--	
Recreation and Entertainment	Indoor or small scale	P	
	Outdoor or large scale	C	
Retail sales		L6	
Sexually oriented businesses		--	
Vehicle & Equipment Services		L10	
	Car wash	L10	See § 1419-11
	Fuel sales	--	See § 1419-15
	Vehicle repair	L11	See § 1419-27
	Automobile holding facility	--	
Industrial Uses			
Production industry			
	Artisan	P	
	General	C	
	Intensive high-impact	--	See § 1419-19
	Limited	P	
Research & development		C	
Warehouse & Storage	Contractor's storage	L3	
	Indoor storage	P	
	Oil & gas storage	--	
	Outdoor storage	--	
Metal waste salvage yard/ junk yards		--	
Waste management		--	
	Waste collection	--	See § 1419-31
	Waste disposal	--	
	Waste transfer	--	See § 1419-31
Wholesale & distribution		C	
Transportation, Communication and Utilities			
Communications facilities		C	
Public utility distribution system		L12	
Public utility maintenance yard		--	
Public utility plant		--	
Radio & television broadcast antenna		--	
Transportation Facilities	Airports	--	
	Heliports	C	
	Railroad train yards	--	
	Railroad right-of-way	P	
	Transportation passenger terminals	C	
Truck Terminal and Warehouse		--	
air and port Commercial Piers and Ports		--	

Marinas	--	
Wireless communication antenna	L4	See § 1419-33
Wireless communication tower	C	See § 1419-33
Mining and quarrying	--	
Accessory Uses		
Any accessory use not listed below	L5	
Commercial services	P	See § 1419-35, 37
Commercial vehicle parking	P	
Drive box	L15	
Exterior lighting	P	See § 1421-39
Fences and walls	P	See § 1421-33
Home occupations	P	See § 1419-17
Refuse storage areas	P	See § 1421-35
Rooming unit	L8	
Small scale specialized incinerator	--	
Transitional Housing	--	
Nonconforming Uses		See Chapter 1447

Specific Limitations

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>L1 Only rooming houses licensed pursuant to Chapter 855. Rooming Houses of the Municipal Code; the maximum number of rooming units is five, and a separate entrance for access to rooming units must be provided. The minimum rental is seven days. See § 1421-43.</p> | <p>L2 Fencing, a minimum of four feet in height must be provided for purposes of securing outdoor play areas which must be located in the rear.</p> |
| <p>L3 Permitted provided outdoor storage is screened so as not to be visible from adjacent streets.</p> | <p>L4 Antenna height may not exceed 20 feet; greater height requires a conditional use approval. The antenna may be attached to a multi-family, public and semi-public or public utility building or structure.</p> |
| <p>L5 Accessory uses determined by the Director of Buildings and Inspections to be customarily incidental to a use of the district are permitted. All others require conditional use approval.</p> | <p>L6 Use is limited to 15,000 square feet; more space requires conditional use approval.</p> |

Specific Limitations

- L7 A separate entrance for access to rooming units must be provided in a mixed-use building.
- L8 No more than two rooming units may be rented or leased in any dwelling.
- L9 Drive through facilities are not permitted.
- L10 Permitted as secondary use located within a parking garage
- L11 Permitted when the entire use is located in a fully enclosed structure.
- L12 The facility must be underground, within a building or on the roof within an enclosure.
- L13 Accessory to a public or semi public use provided that the drivebox is at least 100 feet from any property used for residential purposes.

§ 1418-07. Development Regulations.

Schedule 1418-07 below prescribes the development regulations for the UM district, including lot area for every unit, minimum lot width, setbacks and maximum height. Figure 1418-07 illustrates the setbacks for the UM district. Where an overlay district applies, the provisions of that district take precedence if there is conflict with the standards of this Section.

Schedule 1418-07 Development Regulations – Urban Mix District

<i>Building Form and Location</i>	<i>Setbacks (ft.)</i>						
	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Lot Area/ Unit (sq. ft.)	Lot width (ft.)	Front Yard (Min/Max.)	Side Yard Min./Total (Min)	Rear Yard (Min)	Maximum Height (ft.)
UM Residential	2,000	700	25	0/10	0/0	10	45
UM Non-residential	2,000	0	25	0/0	0/0	10	45
UM Rowhouse	1,500	700	25	0/10	0/0	10	45
Interior	1,500	700	25	0/10	0/0	10	45
Exterior							
UM Other Use	2,000	2,000	25	0/0	0/0	10	45

Regulations	UM	Additional Regulations
<i>Vehicle Accommodation - Driveways and Parking</i>		
Driveway Restrictions	NO	
Drive-Through Facilities	NO	
Required Parking	YES	See 1418-09 and amend 1425- 17*- to include UM: 1 sp/du
Location of Parking	YES	See 1425- 15
Parking Lot Landscaping	NO	
Parking Lot Screening	YES	See 1425-27
Truck Dock; Loading; Service Areas	YES	See 1403-09
<i>Other Regulations</i>		
Buffering along District Boundaries	YES	See 1423-14
Accessory Structures	YES	See Chapter 1421
General Site Standards	YES	See Chapter 1421
Landscaping and Buffer Yards	YES	See Chapter 1423
Nonconforming Structures	YES	See Chapter 1447
Off Street Parking & Loading	YES	See Chapter 1425
Signs	YES	See Chapter 1427
Additional Development Regulations	YES	See Chapter 1419

“Yes” means additional regulations apply.

§ 1418-09 (and amend 1425-23). Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements.

One space per unit for single-family and multi-family uses (amend 1425-19 to include UM). Parking regulations for other uses apply.

A variance may be granted by the Hearing Examiner to reduce Off-Street Parking requirements for all uses, if alternative parking plans are deemed adequate.

Alternative parking plans include but are not limited to:

Shared Parking. Shared Parking, that is formalized by written agreement, is encouraged to promote efficient use of land and resourced by allowing users to share off-street parking facilities for uses that are located near one another and that have different peak parking demands or different operating hours.

Credit for On-Street Parking Spaces. On-street parking spaces may be used to satisfy a percentage of the requirements for off-street parking.

Bicycle Parking. A reduction in the number of require off-street parking spaces can be made for uses that provide bicycle parking or that make special provisions to accommodate bicyclists.

Pedestrian Oriented Use. For uses that serve the immediate neighborhood, a reduction in the number of required parking spaces may be made

Transit Credit. When located proximate to a bus stop, credit towards the parking requirement may be granted.

Chapter 1410. Urban Mix District

§ 1410-01. PURPOSES.....6

§ 1410-05. LAND USE REGULATIONS.....6

§ 1410-07. DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.....11

§ 1410-09. OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REQUIREMENTS.....12

Shared Parking. Shared Parking, that is formalized by written agreement, is encouraged to promote efficient use of land and resourced by allowing users to share off-street parking facilities for uses that are located near one another and that have different peak parking demands or different operating hours.

Credit for On-Street Parking Spaces. On-street parking spaces may be used to satisfy a percentage of the requirements for off-street parking.

Bicycle Parking. A reduction in the number of require off-street parking spaces can be made for uses that provide bicycle parking or that make special provisions to accommodate bicyclists.

Pedestrian Oriented Use. For uses that serve the immediate neighborhood, a reduction in the number of required parking spaces may be made

Transit Credit. When located proximate to a bus stop, credit towards the parking requirement may be granted.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Jennifer Walke, Senior Planner, presented this item.

Ms. Walke stated that at the September 1, 2006 meeting, the Planning Commission directed staff to move forward on the proposed new zoning district entitled Urban Mix. She gave a brief history and overview of the new zoning district proposal and zoning map amendment.

Ms. Julia Carney, Law Department, stated that she modified the language regarding the process used by the Zoning Hearing Examiner to grant special exceptions for reduced parking requirements.

Mr. Christopher Muzzo presented a letter from the F. L. Emmert Company, which is located within the boundaries of the proposed Urban Mix zone. He stated that he is concerned that the zone change may negatively impact his company's ability to make improvements or additions in the future. He suggested revising the boundaries of the proposed district to exclude his property.

Ms. Walke stated that MG (Manufacturing General) would be a conditional use in the Urban Mix district. The existing business would be grandfathered in but future expansion would require a hearing with the Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Cliff Meyer, owner of ABC Sign, stated that he supported the proposed new Urban Mix District and zoning map amendment.

Mr. Fred Berger, property owner, stated that he supported the proposed new Urban Mix District and zone change and felt that the new district would allow creative new uses for old buildings.

Mr. Denny Dellinger, owner of the Jackson Brewery property, stated that he was in favor of the proposed new Urban Mix District and zone change.

Mr. Jeff Raser, architect and resident, stated that the Urban Mix Zoning District would allow multi-family uses to occur while still maintaining manufacturing uses. He stated that the purpose of the new zone is to retain manufacturing, keep and create jobs, allow commercial uses and permit people to move back into the neighborhood.

Mr. Faux stated that the Urban Mix District would make it slightly more difficult but not forbid manufacturing companies to expand. He added that he felt the new district would create a good balance between manufacturing and other uses.

Ms. McCray stated that several areas in the urban core of the city had been mentioned as appropriate areas for this new zoning district. She asked if any neighborhood development groups had expressed interest in adopting the Urban Mix District. In response, Ms. Walke stated that a couple of groups had spoken with members of the Brewery District Community Urban Redevelopment Corporation and indicated their interest, but that none had formally made a request to the City Staff.

Mr. Tarbell stated that he felt the proposed new Urban Mix District and zone change was a great plan. He stated that he applauds the people that put the proposal together and that it breaks new ground for the City in a very meaningful way. He said that he felt it would set the pace for an abundance of borderline districts in Cincinnati. He also stated that future mass transit improvements would tie in with this new district, which would also alleviate some of the parking issues. He said that he would recommend approval of the staff recommendations without the addition of the new parking regulation language. He said that the new language is constraining and not appropriate. He said that he felt that the emphasis needed to be on mass transit to achieve a better traffic and parking mix.

Mr. Faux stated that his understanding of the proposed changed parking language was to make it consistent with the current Zoning Code. Ms. Carney concurred and stated that in the original proposal any reduction in parking would require a hearing before the Hearing Examiner. The new language put the requirement into the special exception context to make it consistent with the current operation of the Hearing Examiner. There would be no substantive change in procedure from the original language to the proposed new language.

Mr. Raser stated that he had not had the opportunity to review the new language and therefore could not comment on it. He stated that the final days of a two-and-a-half year process was no time to bring up new language. He added that there had been ample time in the past to bring forth new ideas and allow the opportunity for all parties to review it.

Ms. McCray stated that she found no inconsistencies in the new language and asked that Mr. Tarbell accept it as a friendly amendment to his recommendation.

Motion: Mr. Tarbell moved approval of Item #3 with the language change as proposed by the Law Department.
Second: Ms. McCray
Ayes: Mr. Faux, Ms. McCray, Mr. vom Hofe, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Tarbell
Nays: None, **motion carried**

ITEM #4 2007 City Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

*****DRAFT*****

**2007 PROPOSED MEETING DATES FOR THE
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

January 5 and 19

February 2 and 16

March 2 and 16

April 6 and 20

May 4 and 18

June 1 and 15

July 6 and July 20

August 3 and 17

September 7 and 21

October 5 and 19

November 2 and 16

December 7 and 21

DISCUSSION

Ms. Margaret Wuerstle, Chief Planner, presented this item.

Mr. Faux stated that typically in the past, depending on workload, there had been only one meeting in July and August. He said that he would suggest leaving the schedule as proposed and if needed the Commission could change the Schedule closer to the summer.

Motion: Ms. McCray moved adoption of the 2007 Planning Commission schedule as proposed.
Second: Mr. vom Hofe
Ayes: Mr. Faux, Ms. McCray, Mr. vom Hofe, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Tarbell
Nays: None, motion carried

ADJOURN

Motion: Mr. vom Hofe motioned to adjourn.
Second: Mr. Faux
Ayes: Mr. Faux, Ms. McCray, Mr. vom Hofe, Mr. Dohoney and Mr. Tarbell
Nays: None, motion carried

Margaret A. Wuerstle, AICP
Chief Planner

Caleb Faux, Chair

Date: _____

Date: _____